



No. 616.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, A. D. 1921.

JOHN HILL, Jr., et al.,

Appellants.

vs.

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary of Agriculture, et al.,

Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS.

HENRY S. ROBBINS,

Counsel for Appellants.



SUBJECT INDEX.

	PAGES
STATEMENT OF CASE	1-11
Class suit by members of the Chicago Board of Trade to have Future Trading Act declared unconstitutional, on appeal from District Court—	
Provisions of the Future Trading Act.....	2-5
Organization of the Chicago Board, its rules, revenue, property, and memberships therein.	5-7
Different kinds of trading by members....	5-7-9-11
Errors Relied Upon.....	12
ARGUMENT	13
I. Power to impress property with public use not applicable to this act.....	13-20
II. Section 5 (e) compelling admission to membership of representatives of Farmers Co-Operative Associations and sanctioning "patronage dividends," deprives the Board and its members of their property without due process of law.....	20-30
Members may sue for protection.....	30
III. The regulatory provisions of the act are not within the commerce power of congress..	31-50
What the regulatory features are.....	31-33
Description of future trading.....	34-38
Cases applicable	38-50
The Board of Trade, its members, etc., to be construed together as instrumentality not a part of, but only in aid of, interstate commerce, and cases supporting this	44
IV. The power to tax.....	50-68
This court frequently has condemned state statutes which were a roundabout way of exercising a power not possessed	52-54

	PAGES
Chief Justice White's argument as Senator against constitutionality of similar act.....	58
This court may consider real purpose of Con- gress when this is apparent from other pro- visions than mere amount of tax. Provisions of this act invalidate the tax because in ex- cess of power to tax.....	60
The regulatory features of act also invalid be- cause having no relation to the collection of tax	51-66
The tax here used as a mere penalty to compel enforcement of a regulating statute which Congress has no power to pass.....	66, 67
V. The tax on "Puts" and "Calls"—	
Should also be adjudged invalid.....	68

APPENDIX.

Copy of Future Trading Act.

CITATIONS.

American Live Stock Co. v. Live Stock Exchange, 143 Ill. 210	14, 22
Austin v. Tennessee, 179 U. S. 343.....	41
Arkadelphia Co. v. St. Louis Ry. Co., 249 U. S. 134, 151	41
Askren v. Continental Oil Co., 252 U. S. 444.....	41
Brass v. North Dakota, 153 U. S. 391.....	15
Budd v. New York, 143 U. S. 517, 545.....	15, 16, 47
Board of Trade v. Nelson, 162 Ill. 431, 438.....	22
Board of Trade v. Dickinson, 114 Ill. App. 295.....	28
Board of Trade v. Christie, 198 U. S. 236.....	38
Brown v. Maryland, 12 Wheaton, 419.....	40, 57
Bacon v. Illinois, 227 U. S. 504, 516.....	42
Brodnax v. Missouri, 219 U. S. 285.....	45, 48
Booth v. Illinois, 184 U. S. 425.....	45

	PAGES
Blumenstock Bros. v. Curtis Publishing Co., 252 U. S. 436	49
Board of Trade v. U. S., 246 U. S. 231.....	9, 49
Buchanan v. Warley, 245 U. S. 60, 74.....	21
Boyd v. United States, 116 U. S. 635.....	67
Chicago Board of Trade v. United States, 246 U. S. 231	9, 49
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. P. R. R. v. Wisconsin, 238 U. S. 491	20
Cole v. LaGrange, 113 U. S. 1.....	20
Coe v. Errol, 116 U. S. 517.....	41
Crescent Oil Co. v. State of Mississippi, decided by this court November 14, 1921.....	42
Covington v. Kentucky, 154 U. S. 213.....	47
Cargill Co. v. Minnesota, 180 U. S. 452, 470.....	49
Chy Lung v. Freeman, 92 U. S. 275.....	54
Cannon v. New Orleans, 21 Wall. 277.....	54
Dodge v. Woolsey, 18 How. 331.....	29
Engel v. O'Malley, 219 U. S. 139.....	40
Express cases, 117 U. S. 29.....	14
Eubank v. Richmond, 226 U. S. 137.....	20
Ficklen v. Shelby Co., 145 U. S. 1.....	49
Filor v. United States, 9 Wall. 45, 49.....	21
German Alliance Ins. Co. v. Kansas, 233 U. S. 389....	15
Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries, 251 U. S. 146....	17
Hopkins v. United States, 171 U. S. 587.....	17, 33, 40, 45
Hyde v. Woods, 94 U. S. 523.....	29
Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U. S. 251.....	42, 50
Hooper v. California, 155 U. S. 648.....	48
House v. Mayes, 219 U. S. 270	49
Henderson v. Mayor, 92 U. S.	53
Ill. R. S., Ch. 38, Sec. 130.....	35, 45, 68
License Tax Cases, 5 Wall. 462.....	62
Ladd v. S. C. P. & M. Co., 53 Texas, 174.....	62
Lawton v. Steele, 152 U. S. 133-137.....	16

	PAGES
Legal Tender cases, 12 Wall. 535.....	52
Loan Assn. v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655.....	54
McCrary v. United States, 195 U. S. 27.....	60
McCulloch v. Maryland, 4 Wheat. 315.....	52, 56
McCarthy Bros. v. Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, 105 Minn. 497.....	23
May v. New Orleans, 178 U. S. 496.....	41
Munn v. People, 94 U. S. 113.....	13, 15, 16, 47
Missouri Pacific Rwy. v. Nebraska, 164 U. S. 403....	14, 20
Missouri Railway v. Nebraska, 217 U. S. 196.....	20
Monongahela Co. v. United States, 148 U. S. 312, 343.....	21, 67
Mutual Film Corporation v. Ohio Industrial Comm., 236 U. S. 230.....	41
Merchants Exchange v. Missouri, 248 U. S. 365....	42, 48
Morgan v. Louisiana, 118 U. S. 455.....	53
Minnesota v. Barber, 136 U. S. 313.....	54
Mugler v. Kansas, 123 U. S. 661.....	54
Nathan v. Louisiana, 8 How. 73, 80.....	46
N. Y. Life Ins. Co. v. Deer Lodge Co., 231 U. S. 496, 511.....	40
N. Y. Central v. Mohney, 252 U. S. 152.....	41
N. Y. Life Insurance Co. v. Cravens, 178 U. S. 389....	48
Oklahoma v. Kansas Nat. Gas Co., 221 U. S. 229, 253..	21
Peabody v. United States, 231 U. S. 530.....	21
People v. Board of Trade, 80 Ill. 134.....	22
Page v. Edmunds, 187 U. S. 596.....	29
Purity Extract Co. v. Lynch, 226 U. S. 192.....	41
Public Utilities Co. v. Landon, 249 U. S. 236.....	41
Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall. 168.....	48
Pittsburgh Co. v. Louisiana, 156 U. S. 590.....	49
Ryan v. Cudahy, 157 Ill. 108.....	30
State v. Duluth Board of Trade, 107 Minn. 506.....	28
Soon Hing v. Crowley, 113 U. S. 703.....	54
Tennessee v. Davis, 100 U. S. 257, 302.....	17

	PAGES
Veazie Bank v. Fenno, 8 Wall. 533.....	56
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U. S. 542.....	17
United States v. E. C. Knight Co., 156 U. S. 1, 13....	41
U. S. Fidelity Co. v. Kentucky, 231 U. S. 394.....	49
U. S. v. Patten, 226 U. S. 525.....	49
U. S. v. DeWitt, 9 Wall. 42.....	61
U. S. v. Doremus, 249 U. S. 86.....	62
Ware & Leland v. Mobile County, 209 U. S. 405.....	38
Weigle v. Curtice Bros. Co., 248 U. S. 285.....	41
Williams v. Fears, 179 U. S. 270.....	49